

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on May 14, 2007. Claims 1-7, 10, 11, 15 and 17-57 are pending in the application. The objections and rejections are as stated below:

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claims 4 and 11 are objected to because of the following informalities:  
  
In particular, claims 4 and 11 are duplicates, either claim 4 or 11 has to be amended or canceled. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Specification***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to support the subject matter set forth in the claims. The specification, as originally filed does not provide support for the invention as now claimed.

The test to be applied under the written description portion of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is whether the disclosure of the application as originally filed reasonably conveys to the artisan that the inventor had possession at that time of later claimed subject matter. *Vas-Cat, Inc. v.*

Mahurkar, 935 F. 2d 1555, 1565, 19 USPQ2d 111, 1118 (Fed. Cir. 1991), reh'rg denied (Fed. Cir. July 8, 1991) and reh'rg, en banc, denied (Fed. Cir. July 29, 1991).

Claims 17-33 and 45-55 include the limitation of "...holding the order in abeyance from the market..." However, the specification does not provide an enabling disclosure to support the claimed step of "...holding the order in abeyance from the market..."

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 17-33 and 45-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, claims 17-33 and 45-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by

Art Unit: 3691

another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-7, 10, 11, 15 and 17-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Woodmansey et al. US Pat. No. 7,155,410 B1, (hereinafter "Woodmansey").

Claims 1-3, 10, 15, 31-33, 42, 43, 54, 55, Woodmansey discloses a method for use in an electronic trading system, the method comprising the acts of:

receiving a bid (abstract, column 3, lines 56-67);

receiving a designation of a linking parameter linking the bid to an offer based on historical market data (column 8, lines 41-47), and generating an offer based at least in part on the received bid and the received designated linking parameter (abstract, column 2, lines 40-50, column 5, lines 37-48);

bringing the linked bid and offer to market wherein; the offer and the bid are brought to market substantially simultaneously, the substantial simultaneity being enforced by the trading system (fig. 5, element 512, column 6, lines 26-41, and column 11, lines 5-8).

Claims 4-7, 11 and 49, Woodmansey discloses the steps of prompting a user to input the linking parameter (fig. 2A, element 204, and column 5, lines 37-48), generating a price spread between the bid and the offer, generating a size of the offer based on a size of volume spread between the bid and the offer, and generating a price spread and a size of the offer based on a size of volume spread between the bid and the offer (column 2, lines 58-65, column 4, line 46 thru column 5, line 20).

Claims 17, 34, 35, 44, 45, 56 and 57, Woodmansey discloses a method and computer readable medium programmed to cause an electronic trading system to:

generating an electronic record of an order to trade on behalf of a trader on a market implemented in an electronic trading system, and holding the order record in abeyance from the market (abstract, column 3, lines 56-67);

generating an electronic record of a counter-order to trade on behalf of the same trader, the counter-order having a parameter linked to a parameter of the order such that the linked parameter of the counter-order will fluctuate over time with market conditions (abstract, column 2, lines 40-50, column 5, lines 37-48); and

under control of the electronic trading system, substantially simultaneously bringing to market the order and the counter-order (fig. 5, element 512, column 6, lines 26-41, and column 11, lines 5-8).

Claims 18 and 19, Woodmansey discloses that the order is a bid to buy, and the counter-order is an offer to sell and the order is an offer to sell, and the counter-order is a bid to buy (column 1, line 60 thru column 2, line 57).

Claims 20-22, 36, 37, 46-48, Woodmansey discloses that the linking of the parameters is performed at the explicit request of the trader as the counter-order is entered (abstract), the electronic trading system provides to the trader a screen display interface for entering the order

and counter-order, and the screen display interface has the capability of prompting the trader to enter the order and counter-order as linked bid and offer (fig. 3).

Claims 23-25, 38 and 50, Woodmansey discloses that the parameters of the order and counter-order to be linked are detected at least in part automatically by the electronic trading system; the electronic trading system issues a prompt to the trader to link the order and counter-order, wherein the counter-order is generated at least in part automatically by the electronic trading system in response to the generating of the order (abstract, column 2, lines 40-50, column 5, lines 37-48).

Claims 26 and 27, Woodmansey discloses that the order and counter-order are for items that are the same as each other, in the sense of being fungible instances of the item (column 5, lines 21-57).

Claims 28-30, 39-41 and 51-53, Woodmansey discloses that the size of the counter-order is linked as a function of the size of the order, the price of the counter-order is linked as a function of the price of the order, and the size of the counter-order is linked as a function of the price of the order (column 2, lines 3-15, column 6, line 59 thru column 7, line 29 and column 8, line 65 thru column 9, line 58).

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 10, 11, 15 and 17-57 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hani Kazimi whose telephone number is (571) 272-6745. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

/Hani M. Kazimi/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3691